



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

dom. Sparta, as an interesting educational experiment, is a valuable contribution to the history of education, but it is no less instructive to the political philosopher.*

Let us now look at Athens.

S. S. Laurie

University of Edinburgh

LATIN IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

Over one hundred thousand of the pupils of our high schools and academies were, according to the recently issued report of the Commissioner of Education, pursuing the study of Latin in the school year 1889-90. That is to say about 33 per cent. of the total membership of our secondary schools were taking Latin. Of other studies algebra alone outranked Latin in numbers and percentage—a popularity due, I fancy, not to any Adonis-like charms in the study itself, but rather to its Charon-like demands that every unfortunate wayfarer should pay his obolus. These statistics must afford little consolation to those who think that Latin is in a state of decline. Educationists and men of affairs alike agree as to the value and importance of Latin and the testimony of men of such widely different spheres of activity as Superintendent E. E. White of Cincinnati and Charles A. Dana of the *New York Sun* agrees as to the serious consequences involved in dropping it or giving it even a secondary position in our educational system. To any teacher who holds with Professor Tate that the “great end of all our teaching is the development of the faculties,” the worth of Latin must remain unquestioned. I do not know but that I am ready to say that every pupil who expects to graduate from our high schools should, unless there is some uncommonly good reason, be required to take at least two years of Latin. The Lawrenceville (N. J.) school requires that

* Some may think that I have quoted too much from Plutarch, but I have done so only where his statements are in harmony with the results of modern criticism.

every graduate from its courses shall have had three years of Latin—and I am not sure but the requirement is wise. Latin is built upon a firm and sure foundation. What is needed is not an apology for its study or an argument for its value, but an enthusiastic appreciation, on the part of all who are teaching it or intend to teach it, of its worth and its dignity.

Granted then that we are appreciative of the place and the importance of Latin; granted that we are fully alive to the responsibility of giving to one hundred thousand Latin neophytes, the very best equivalent and the most satisfactory returns for their time and labor—how shall we do it? In other words, what aims and what methods of teaching will best tend to inculcate Latin most rapidly, accurately, and permanently in the minds of our pupils and at the same time awaken and keep alive in them an attachment, even an enthusiasm, for the subject? “Method,” as Professor Thomas has very thoughtfully observed, “has two meanings. One signifies a teacher’s entire character displaying itself in his work; the other, much more common, is synonymous with routine. Before one should ask how one shall teach, there are two other questions that one should ask oneself: What knowledge am I seeking to impart? And to what end?”

To the consideration of these two questions, either directly or by implication, we now purpose to devote ourselves. When we have clearly and definitely in mind the goal toward which we are striving, the question of method will soon enough adjust itself to the requirements. But until we do have a clearly defined aim, methods and results alike are apt to be in a decidedly chaotic condition. What then is the aim, or what are the aims, of the preparatory work in Latin?

It has been my pleasure, in the course of the preparation of this paper, to gather together specimen entrance examination questions recently used by five or six of our leading and representative institutions—Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Cornell, the University of Chicago, and the University of Michigan. It seemed to me that from them I could best and most satisfactorily determine what, in the judgment of the heads of our leading Latin departments, was expected and demanded of the preparatory teacher.

The old, immemorial requirements, such as a knowledge of forms, of syntax, of scansion, &c., need not be dwelt upon. They

are familiar to us all. Almost all teachers give to these points the requisite attention. What I wish particularly to invite consideration to are the changed and increased demands, first in the matter of translating Latin at sight and second in the matter of Latin writing. As might be expected, the colleges I have mentioned differ widely as to the extensiveness of the demand along these lines and as to the importance attached to them. In the matter of translation at sight Harvard and the University of Chicago, for instance, represent what might be termed the extreme view. Their test of the candidate's knowledge of Latin lies wholly and exclusively along the line of sight-reading. If they can avoid it, they will never give a candidate a passage of Latin he has read before. Allow me to quote from a letter received recently from Professor Hale, of the University of Chicago. Referring to the entrance examination papers he had sent me, he says: "Their most salient point will not, of course, escape your attention: namely, their demand that the pupil should translate *at sight*. In fact, although we may, of course, make mistakes, it is our intention at these examinations *never* to use passages which the student has seen before. In this respect Harvard and Chicago now stand alone; but I think that we shall not stand alone for many years." Further on he asks, "Do you happen to have seen a pamphlet of mine upon the 'Art of Reading Latin'? *It indicates what seems to me should be the spirit of all the earlier work in Latin.*"

I quote this letter both as setting forth the demands made upon the preparatory Latin teacher from one side, and as indicating what, in the opinion of so learned and scholarly an authority as Professor Hale, should be the end and aim of the preparatory work, *viz.*: the ability to translate any Latin of the average difficulty of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil at sight—that is to say, without previous preparation and with the slightest use of notes and vocabulary.

In another class belong more or less loosely, the representatives of the older and more conservative view of what should be demanded and expected of the candidate. These institutions either make no demand at all in the way of sight-reading, as the University of Michigan, and Princeton, or their demands are limited, as at Cornell, where one short passage of no particular difficulty was

assigned. At Yale they require, along with an examination in the prepared work—Caesar, Cicero, &c.,—a passage of prose, of considerable length and fairly difficult, to be translated at sight. It might be proper to state, however, that Princeton, in its last Calendar announces that, beginning with the year 1894, passages for translation at sight will be given along with the test in prepared work. But whatever institutions may be behindhand, there is little doubt as to the tendency. Sight-reading, on a more or less extended scale, is something that we preparatory teachers must reckon on and prepare for. There may be room for discussion as to the emphasis to be placed upon sight-reading. It may be that the position taken by Harvard and Chicago represents an extreme reaction from the old, time-honored demands, and that the method pursued by Yale, Princeton, and Cornell in requiring passages from the prepared text as well as from a text that has never been read before,—will most truthfully indicate the student's acquirements and power; but in any case the demands upon the preparatory teacher are undoubted and imperative, and the ability to read Latin at sight, without the aid of copious notes and a constantly consulted vocabulary, is, so far as time and opportunity permit, to be assiduously and zealously cultivated by the teacher.

While I believe that a vastly increased attention should be given to this side of our Latin work, it may not be amiss, in case a new-born zeal should get the better of our discretion, to utter one or two words of caution. In the first place, there is danger, as Professor Bennett of Cornell very clearly points out in an article in the May number of the *SCHOOL REVIEW*, that entire and absolute devotion to the sight-reading idea may be injurious to accurate scholarship and be the occasion of a good deal of superficial work. Let me quote his words on the subject: "The habit which has become prevalent among us of endeavoring to gallop over large amounts of Latin which the pupil cannot readily apprehend, not only possesses no advantages—it is perfectly demoralizing." The point to be borne in mind, it seems to me, is that we are not to attempt too much, and that our zeal for reading Latin at sight ought not to tempt us to sacrifice quality to quantity of work, or accuracy to a fondness for being in the fashion. It is not to be forgotten either that the average high

school student has not reached a very mature period in his intellectual development and a great deal is not to be expected of him. Perhaps if he could read selections from Eutropius or the "*Viri Romae*," it would be all that we ought to expect. Such work as this—using, for instance, Professor Greenough's recently issued pamphlet selections from Eutropius, or Professor Rolfe's edition of "*Viri Romae*"—might be introduced without difficulty either for a few minutes each day or for a proportionately longer period two or three times a week.

As to the cultivation of the ability to read Latin at sight, I do not know that I have any specially new methods to exploit. The best way to read Latin at sight, so far as I know, is to *read*—read just as much as you can possibly find time for and just as much as can be done thoroughly. Train the pupil to the habit of accurately locating forms and of taking the words in the order in which they are written. The acquirement of a vocabulary is also, of course, a very necessary and essential thing and I think much greater pains should be taken to enlarging this. To this end I find the memorizing of synonyms and common idioms, the study of word-groups based upon the same root to be very helpful. The memorizing of passages has a tendency to cultivate a *feeling* for the language and this, after all, is the great end. Experience and the desire to attain the end aimed at will suggest to every wide-awake teacher methods of procedure.

Before I take up the topic of Latin writing, permit me to say a few words in reference to the relation of Latin to English, a matter, which, perhaps, undue attention to sight-reading may cause us to overlook. The end of Latin may not be to learn English, but certainly its end is not to demoralize English. Without any lessening of the effort toward the acquisition of larger power and greater freedom in the translation of the Latin *as Latin*, attention can easily be given to the English renderings of the prepared Latin work.

In these days when the demand for purer and better English, and for greater power of expression, is so all-pervading and insistent, I am still antediluvian enough to believe that the training which produced such stylists as Macaulay, Addison, Newman, and Matthew Arnold, is still the best and most fruitful method for cultivating a broad and accurate acquaintance with our mother

tongue. No boy can work day after day, year in and year out, at the task of transferring Latin—a language whose thought and idiom are so remote from our own—into good, accurate, idiomatic English, without gaining a vastly increased acquaintance with the resources and the possibilities of our royal English tongue. And so I hold that we teachers of preparatory Latin should insist ever and always—constantly and unceasingly—upon clear-cut, well-expressed, properly-arranged *English* translations. It is one of the much flaunted charges against the study of the classics, that it tends to that demoralization in the use of English which must necessarily be the accompaniment of the slovenly, any-way-to-get-over-the-ground translations with which the ears of the man who loves beauty in language, as well as in all else, are often distressed. If Latin is to maintain its enviable position in the educational curriculum it cannot afford to give its enemies the foothold which it unfortunately often does give, but rather it ought to be—as it may in the hands of the alert and thoughtful teacher—the most valuable and most loyal handmaid in the work of maintaining that accurate and discriminating use of the English language, which is the sign and seal of the educated and cultured man. To secure this end, it seems to me, the teacher should never for an instant permit the pupil to translate the review lesson at least, in a slovenly and un-idiomatic way. This can be brought about, I should say, without any display of harshness on the teacher's part, simply by example, by precept, by inspiring in the pupils a kindly rivalry, and by creating in them a feeling for linguistic beauty. In fine, we should teach Latin not for the sake of English, but for the sake of Latin; as much Latin as you can teach and your pupils can learn; as much Latin as, by memorizing, by reviewing, by composition, by etymological study, by word grouping, can be instilled into them, but ever bearing in mind that it is in our power, by care and watchfulness, to make the Latin the most efficient instrument and the most fruitful agent in the acquirement of a mastery of the language of our own thought and our own life.

As to methods in general, I fear I have but little that is new or helpful to offer. I believe that memoriter work is good, and every week I manage to give my pupils a few lines to commit to memory. Usually, at the beginning of the recitation period, I

devote a few minutes to oral work, usually sentences based on the review lesson illustrating some principle of syntax which I wish to impress upon them. This, I find, produces excellent results and at the same time dispenses with the feeling of drudgery which is likely to come to a student who works out the sentences given for oral work in such books as Daniell's, or Collar's, *Composition*. As Mr. Hull, in justifying the limited number of exercises in the new Latin Lessons prepared by him and Mr. Preble, says: "I believe that drill work on the paradigms should be confined largely to the class room, and the pupil should be saved the drudgery and the consequent dislike for the study which arises from being compelled to write out a large number of uninteresting sentences." So, every day, I give my pupils a few sentences, designed, as I have said, to illustrate some point in syntax or some idiom, or some weak point in their translation, and I find the practice profitable and, so far as I can judge, interesting. For the acquirement of a vocabulary I am following the plan of Mr. Collar's "*Gate to Caesar*,"—studies in word-groups and in synonyms, and this, in addition to the memorizing of such common idioms and expressions as are to be found, has seemed to work exceedingly well. I believe, too, in a constant and, if possible, daily drill in etymology—in the declensions and conjugations. A few words each day will answer the purpose and but a few minutes need be consumed.

But in the discussion of methods, I wish especially to deal with the vexed problem of Latin prose composition, and I doubt not I shall be pardoned, if I devote the rest of my time and attention to this topic. I question very much whether there is an aspect of preparatory Latin which calls for more thoughtful and more anxious care on the part of the conscientious teacher than this of Latin composition. It is the almost invariable testimony of Latin teachers that there is no part of their work which is so unsatisfactory or so seemingly unproductive of results commensurate with the work and energy bestowed on it as is this. Pupils dread it as an unmitigated "grind" and teachers push it through by main force, feeling that it is a disagreeable and unprofitable task, to be disposed of as quickly as possible. It is a dose of distasteful medicine, necessary for Latin life, but to be taken only as a dire necessity and with a most gruesome face. That such an unfortunate feeling exists there can be little doubt in the mind of any

one who has conversed with preparatory teachers. There is a very prevalent and well-grounded dissatisfaction with the results achieved.

Not to spend any more words on the problem, but at once granting that there is a problem, let us consider what solution, if any, can be found. The problem facing us, as I take it, is this: Can Latin prose composition be so taught that it will achieve the desired result—a reasonable degree of facility in writing ordinary prose—and at the same time develop and maintain such interest and enthusiasm that the subject will no longer be a bore. That study only is distasteful and burdensome in which the pupil feels that the time and effort expended are excessively disproportionate to the results obtained; when he feels that he is in the position of the underpaid workman. So far as my experience has gone, the majority of boys and girls are willing to work hard and faithfully, provided only they are getting some adequate return for their labor. This, it strikes me, has been the fatal difficulty with Latin composition. The pupils have toiled and struggled faithfully, even desperately, but the returns have been altogether disappointing. What is to be done? The desirable end—is it not?—is the maximum of power in writing Latin with the minimum of friction and fruitless labor. To attain this desirable end is the aim of every earnest and enthusiastic teacher of Latin.

There are in vogue, to make a general division, two systems of teaching Latin prose. The one is probably most familiarly known through the late Professor Jones's *Exercises in Latin Prose Composition*; the other is represented by such book as Daniell's *Exercises in Latin Composition* or Collar's *Practical Latin Composition*. It is unnecessary to enter into any lengthy description of these two systems. All teachers are familiar with the difference in aim and the consequent difference in method. Through a series of forty lessons, each of which is designed to illustrate some syntactical principle, Professor Jones aimed to give the student as thorough and complete drill as was possible or practicable in preparatory work. The English sentences to be done into Latin, while for the most part based on Caesar and Cicero, have no connection with one another and are simply a number of detached and unrelated sentences having for their sole aim the practical inculcation of some principle of Latin syntax. This method gives no drill

whatever in writing a connected and logically developed narrative. To transfer back into Latin a paraphrase of any given chapter of Caesar, even though it contained no marked peculiarities of syntax or idiom, would, I venture to say, be quite beyond the powers of the accredited student of Jones's Prose. And yet, in spite of the criticisms which may be passed on the book and in spite of a tendency in some quarters to abandon it, its success in fixing firmly in the pupil's mind certain definite principles of Latin syntax and in familiarizing him with a goodly number of Latin idioms is unquestioned. Because of this fact—this definiteness of results; this inculcating of something tangible—the method and the book are still dear to many teachers and in lieu of something surely better they find themselves loath to abandon it.

It was in response to the appeal for such a knowledge of Latin and such facility in using it as would enable the pupil to write a connected piece of narrative Latin, that the more recent textbooks in Latin composition have been written. It was felt that while it was well enough to have a clear notion of ablatives of manner, datives with adjectives, &c., yet these were means not ends, and were to be taught and learned not as ends in themselves but as means to the writing of Latin. I do not know but I might truthfully say that Jones's Latin Prose is no drill-book in Latin writing at all. It is merely the preliminary step to such writing. When one has become familiar with the principles and idioms exemplified in it, one is then just ready to write Latin. The criticism I might pass on both systems is that Jones gives the means without the end, while Collar gives the end without the means. That is to say, while these more modern methods possibly develop a somewhat larger power in writing connected Latin prose, there is still a lack of definiteness about the results of the prose work which leaves the teacher in a rather un-satisfied, if not dissatisfied, state of mind. Take away from the pupil his Caesar and his Cicero and I fear he would make sorry work of his Latin prose. The only remedy is to do so much of this sort of work that the continual repetition of forms and constructions will fix them in the mind. But so much time, unfortunately, is not usually at our disposal. I wish it were. I am a firm believer in Latin composition. I do not believe it is possible to have too much of it. I believe there is nothing like it for familiarizing the pupil with

forms, with idioms, with grammatical constructions—in short, for developing a feeling for the language. It was with this sense of the strength and the weakness of these two systems—the definiteness of the one, with the indefiniteness of the other, that I felt that a combination of the two, so far as practicable, might be desirable and profitable. So this fall I have been using Jones's book as the basis of my work in syntax, assigning, however, but half the sentences in any given lesson. The time that would be devoted to writing the other half is given to writing a piece of connected narrative taken from Collar or Daniell. The experiment, of course, has not as yet progressed very far but it is certainly working well and I am hopeful that it will prove a success. The syntactical drill, which was formerly pure drudgery, has become something live and valuable, for it has an end outside of itself. It becomes the tool whereby the connected work of prose writing is done. The drill in the ablatives absolute and in indirect discourse is seen to be special drill, not for the sake merely of ablatives absolute and of indirect discourse, but that through familiarity with these syntactical principles, a greater facility and larger power of writing connected narrative may be obtained. The pupil has some incentive to work at his seemingly puzzling problems in syntax as they are exemplified and elucidated in Mr. Jones's admirable book. Without a knowledge of these principles he cannot write Latin. To write Latin with ease and accuracy is his aim. He therefore learns his Jones, that he may master his Collar. Of course, I am well aware that the Jones Exercises have no *direct* bearing upon the connected work of Collar and Daniell, but their *indirect* value, their definite and thorough drill in principles of syntax must, of necessity, make them of great value for the correct writing of all prose. In the end I believe every teacher must, in a measure at least, write his own composition book. The exercises given by any or all books may be and will be suggestive; I doubt whether they can be final.

In conclusion let me sum up a few of what seem to me the chief ends of our teaching and work. In the first place we ought to be imbued with an enthusiastic faith in the value of Latin both as a utilitarian and a disciplinary study, and in the second place we must keep clearly in mind the end or ends toward which our work should be constantly directed: first, the cultivation of the

ability to *feel* Latin and to read it with ease and rapidity—to read at sight; second, by constant watchfulness in the use of English, to cultivate a correct and pleasing style of translation, to teach the pupils to discriminate between words, to inspire in them an appreciation and love of style; and then in our work in Latin composition to adopt such means and use such books as will yield the power to write ordinary Latin with reasonable ease and accuracy, whether it be by Jones's book or Daniell's, or both. Only we must be sure that we have developed the ability.

J. H. Harris

*Michigan Military Academy,
Orchard Lake, Mich.*

THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE OF TEN

The major part of the work, outside the committee meetings was done by the chairman, President Eliot. We might almost speak of the report as "Dr. Eliot's report," and yet this would be far from the truth, for I suppose no member of the committee conceded more than he—perhaps no one so much as he—in the various compromises reached. Neither would I be understood as implying that the other members of the committee did little or nothing beyond their work at the two meetings. The preparation for these meetings involved a great amount of correspondence on the part of every member, but the preparatory labor on the part of the chairman must have been more than nine times that of the average member.

The work before the committee at its meeting in November, 1892, was comparatively simple, though in some respects quite as important as that of the second meeting, November, 1893. Among important points settled at the former meeting were the number of conferences to be appointed and the subjects to be considered by each. Some, for instance, believed that the subjects of Latin and Greek might wisely be left to the consideration of the same conference. A compromise was effected